SINGLE BENCH 3

5

C.F. 100

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH

W.P.(C) NO. /2006

PETITIONER : Rajesh Kumar Agrawal, Aged about 36 yrs, S/o. Omprakash Agrawal, R/o. Pardhiyapali, Baramkela, District Raigarh (CG), Through: its Power of Attorney Holder, Rajendra Agrawal S/o. Omprakash, Aged about 33 years, R/o. Sr. Office Suhela, District Bargarh (Orissa)

P.R. No. 45161/06
Presented by Shri K.A. Goyradhan
dated 13/12/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1] Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Through: its Chairman, Raipur, District Raipur (CG)

2] Assistant Engineer, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Baramkela, Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh (CG)

3] Executive Engineer (Vigilance) Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Raigarh, District Raigarh (CG)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR A WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE ACTION THEREBY QUASHING/SETTING ASIDE THE IMPUGNED BILL OF RS 16,12,198/- RAISED BY THE RESPONDENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ALLEGED THEFT OF ENERGY AGAINST K.NO.0314902/90/01/46514 INSTALLED AT PARDHIYAPALI, BARAMKELA, DISTT.RAIGARH,CHATTISGARH

XI-HC-78

(83)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 4467/2006 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

22-1-2007

Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri A.S. Gaharwar, Advocate for the respondents.

Heard on admission.

The petitioner has preferred this petition against issuance of Bill of Annexure P-3 which has been issued for a sum of Rs. 15,07,907/- on the basis of inspection report of Annexure P-2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that subsequent to the inspection report of Annexure P-2, another inspection was conducted in the premises of the petitioner on 30-11-2005 vide Annexure P-8. However, instead of taking action in pursuance of second inspection report, the respondents are insisting for payment against Annexure P-3. He further submits that he had preferred a representation to the Superintending Engineer vide Annexure P-13 raising his grievances against the aforesaid act of the respondents however, they are not deciding his representation.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents/ Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board submits that Chhattisgarh State Electricity Regulatory Commission has framed Chhattisgarh State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Redressal of Grievances of Consumers and Establishment of Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004 and as per Regulation 22, complaint mechanism has been provided for redressal of any dispute of the consumers regarding their electricity bills.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

XI-HC-78

(84)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.4467/06 **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	In view of the submissions made by counsel for respective the parties, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation of Annexure P-13 after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. If the petitioner is unsatisfied with the decision, he may opt for the remedies available under Regulation 22 of the above Regulations. The petition is accordingly disposed of. **Sd/-** **Dhirendra Mishra** **Judge**	

P.T.O.